

*H. C. Dennis 7*

SPEECH

OF

*Williamstown  
College. M.D.*

MR. ALLAN, OF KENTUCKY,

ON THE

DIVISION OF THE PROCEEDS

OF THE

PUBLIC LANDS AMONG THE STATES.

*Davis & Alton*

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,

MARCH, 1836.

---

WASHINGTON.

JACOB GIDEON, JR., PRINTER.

1836.

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

1000

## SPEECH.

---

Mr. WILLIAMS presented the following resolution, and moved that it be referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, with instructions to report a bill in conformity thereto :

*Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to sustain and to vote for the passage of a law providing for the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands among the respective States, according to their respective federal numbers.*

Mr. AILAN took the floor, and said—

Mr. SPEAKER : I rise to discharge the duty requested of me by the Legislature of the State which I have the honor in part to represent. This duty I am happy to know is consistent with the opinions of my immediate constituents.

I am pleased that this great subject is brought before this House by one of the States of this Union—a subject of higher importance than any which was ever submitted to the deliberation of Congress under the present Constitution, and in the decision of which, as I solemnly believe, is involved the fate of our free institutions. It is fit that such a subject should be brought here by a member of the Confederacy. The State comes not to solicit a favor, but to demand a right. I rejoice that the attention of Congress has been thus brought directly to the question, what shall be done with the thirty millions of dollars now in the Treasury over and above the wants of the Government, and the millions of surplus destined hereafter to come into the Treasury ? Shall these vast sums be loaned out to favorites, or shall they all be exhausted in a still further increase of the expenses, power, and patronage of the General Government ? Or shall they be divided among the States ?

These are the grand questions which we are called upon to decide. This is the great business of the session. Yet nearly four months have passed away, and we have not before approached it. The principal occupation of these four months, in my judgment, has been worse than useless; which is the reason why I have not felt it to be my duty to participate in the debates. I repeat that I rejoice that the House is at last brought to the consideration of the subject of the surplus revenue—a subject which has been at the bottom of all the political movements which we have witnessed for more than a year. The excellent law of 1817, which was enacted by the wise and provident councils of that time, for the payment of the national debt, having accomplished its object, we find our Treasury overflowing. It now devolves on the present Congress to decide how this treasure can be most beneficially used for our country. The disposition of the public revenue heretofore had relation chiefly to the annual expenses of the Government and the execution of plans of policy which had been adopted. But, in the present condition of the Treasury, the subject stands connected with a new system of policy, destined to exercise a decisive influence upon the security of our institutions, and the liberty of the People.



Sir, we are thrown here at a most important point of history. Our country is in a situation hitherto unknown. It is our duty to meet the occasion promptly. The weighty contest now depending before Congress and before the nation is, whether the thirty millions of dollars, which are the produce of the honest labor of our constituents, shall be returned to their pockets, or devoted to the schemes of official ambition upon the eve of a Presidential election. In this aspect of the question, it bears directly upon all the great interests of the nation, and upon the interests and liberty of every man in the nation. It is a question between the tax-payers and the tax-receivers—between power and liberty. It is a question that will justify debate in its broadest amplitude of freedom. Sir, it is our duty to call off from the profitless skirmishing on the outposts, in which so much of the session has been consumed, and come at once up to the main battle.

Would you, Mr. Speaker, be willing to adjourn without action? Would you be willing to face the farmers of Tennessee, and tell them that you had left thirty millions of the public money loaned out, without interest, to persons whom you did not know, and for what purposes you could not tell!

I impeach the motives of no one; but inaction accomplishes the purposes of those who desire to let the money remain in its present position better than action. To do nothing gains the prize, or rather retains the prize which they have already fast in their hands.

It is certain that, in the disposition of the surplus revenue, one of three plans will be adopted: 1st. It will either be suffered to remain where it now is; or, 2d. The expenses of the Government will be increased enough to exhaust it; or, 3d. So much of it as has arisen from the sales of the public lands will be divided among the States.

I propose, before I take my seat, to devote some attention to the consideration of each of these plans. But there is an indispensable preliminary inquiry essential to a clear understanding of all the bearings of this important subject. As it is proposed to invest this Government, this central agency, with the use of this vast sum of money, the duty is imposed on us of inquiring how and for what purposes the power already possessed has been used, before we double this power by placing thirty millions more in its reach. As it is known that power is ever on the alert to enlarge its authority, it is the first duty of the representatives of a free People to watch its encroachments upon the public liberty with a sleepless vigilance.

It is a very proper occasion to pause before we make this new and important step to the future, and take an impartial retrospect of the past. We are just entering upon the eighth year of the present administration, and we have before us the estimates and recommendations for the residue of the term; so that we now have a full view of the whole ground; and, upon looking over it, we shall be better able to decide upon the present character of federal power, and its tendencies, and how far it would be prudent to enlarge its boundaries, by placing under its control the surplus treasure of the People. This retrospect is involved in much difficulty; there is no subject about which there is more controversy than "What are the principles of the present Administration?" To this question you receive a different answer from almost every man to whom it is propounded. As the helmsmen of the vessel of State, let us turn to our log-book, and ascertain, if we can, what courses we have been steering. Let us ascertain our latitude and longitude, and find whereabouts we are in the broad political ocean.



In several documents, to which I will take leave to call the attention of the House, we can have a distinct view of the points to which this Administration proposed to steer, before and at the commencement of its voyage. The first I shall offer is the celebrated letter of General Jackson to President Monroe, which contains, in part, the principles upon which this Administration came into power, an extract from which the Clerk read as follows:

“Pardon me, my dear sir, for the following remarks concerning the next Presidential term : they are made with the sincerity and freedom of a friend. I cannot doubt they will be received with feelings similar to those which have impelled me to make them. Every thing depends on the selection of your ministry. In every selection, party and party feelings should be avoided. Now is the time to exterminate that monster called party spirit. By selecting characters most conspicuous for their probity, virtue, capacity, and firmness, without any regard to party, you will go far to, if not entirely, eradicate those feelings which, on former occasions, threw so many obstacles in the way of Government, and, perhaps, have the pleasure and honor of uniting a people heretofore politically divided. The Chief Magistrate of a great and powerful nation should never indulge in party feelings. His conduct should be liberal and disinterested, always bearing in mind that he acts for the whole, and not a part of the community. By this course you will exalt the national character, and acquire for yourself a name as imperishable as monumental marble. Consult no party in your choice ; pursue the dictates of that unerring judgment which has so long and so often benefitted our country, and rendered conspicuous its rulers. These are the sentiments of a friend ; they are the feelings, if I know my own heart, of an undissembled patriot.

“Accept assurances of my sincere friendship, and believe me to be, respectfully, your obedient servant.

“ANDREW JACKSON.

“HON. JAMES MONROE.”

We have in the paper which has just been read, the important principles which the faith of the party now in power was pledged to pursue.

In the appointment of public officers have “characters been selected most conspicuous for their probity, virtue, capacity, and firmness, without any regard to *party*?” On the contrary, can a single instance be found where any one received an office who did not belong to “*the party*?” Have we not seen throughout the land, officers who were conspicuous for their probity, virtue, capacity, and firmness,” hurled from their stations without a charge of misconduct, without a hearing or a trial, because they dared to think and speak according to the dictates of their consciences, and because they did not belong to “the party?”

Has this Administration wielded its power to crush the monster called party-spirit? On the contrary, has not this fell monster been nurtured and fed until it has become a bloated Juggernaut, whose voracious appetite has not been satisfied with a thousand victims of the opposite party, but has, without pity or remorse, crushed beneath its ponderous wheels almost all its original votaries? Must not all worship at the shrine of this idol, under pain of proscription and unrelenting persecution? Has not the irreversible-decree gone forth that all true believers, as a passport to office, must repeat the confession of faith that there is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet? We must seek elsewhere for the principles of this Administration ; they are not to be found in the Monroe letter.



Let us turn over another leaf of our book of reckoning. It is a letter from Gen. Jackson to the Legislature of Tennessee, upon the occasion of his being nominated as a candidate for the Presidency ; an extract from which reads as follows :

“Upon this principle I venture fully to accord with you in the contemplated change proposed to the Constitution, and, indeed, would go further, with a view to sustain more effectually in practice, the axiom which divides the three great classes of power into independent constitutional checks. I would impose a provision rendering any member of Congress ineligible to office, under the General Government, during the term for which he was elected, and for two years thereafter, except in cases of judicial office ; and these I would except, for the reason that vacancies in this department are not frequent occurrences, and because no barrier should be interposed in selecting to the Bench men of the first talents and integrity. Their trusts and duties being of the most responsible kind, the widest possible range should be permitted, that judicious and safe selections might be made. The politician may err, yet his error may be presently retrieved, and no considerable injury result ; but with Judges, particularly in the last resort, error is fatal, because without a remedy.

“The effect of such a constitutional provision is obvious. By it Congress, in a considerable degree, would be free from that connexion with the Executive Department, which at present gives strong ground for apprehension and jealousy on the part of the People. Members, instead of being liable to be withdrawn from legislating on the great interests of the nation through prospects of Executive patronage, would be more liberally confided in by their constituents, while their vigilance would be less interrupted by party feelings and party excitements. Calculations from intrigue and management would fail, nor would their deliberations or their investigations of subjects consume so much time. The morals of the country would be improved, and virtue, uniting with the labors of the Representatives, and with the official ministers of the law, would tend to perpetuate the honor and glory of the Government.

“But if this change in the Constitution should not be obtained, and important appointments continue to devolve on the representatives in Congress, it requires no depth of thought to be convinced that corruption will become the order of the day, and, that, under the garb of conscientious sacrifices to establish precedents for the public good, evils of serious importance to the freedom and prosperity of the Republic may arise. It is through this channel that the People may expect to be attacked in their constitutional sovereignty, and where tyranny may well be apprehended to spring up in some favorable emergency. Against such inroads every guard ought to be interposed, and none better occurs than that of closing the suspected avenue with some necessary constitutional restriction. We know human nature to be prone to evil ; we are early taught to pray that we may not be led into temptation ; and hence the opinion that, by constitutional provision, all avenues to temptation on the part of our political servants should be closed.”

Here the nation is informed that the power of the President to appoint members of Congress to office is the channel through which tyranny will approach, through which corruption will creep, by which the Representatives of the People will be seduced to abandon the posts assigned them by their constituents, by which the legislative power will be brought in base submission to Executive dictation, by which corruption will be the *order of the day*.



view of them ? Have not the People every where beheld the federal officers bearing, with all their force in perfect concert, on elections ? Have we not seen them appointing electioneering meetings of the People, and holding political conventions to control public sentiment, and devoting their industry and their means to influence votes ? Do we not see that thirty millions of the public money are now in a position where it can be easily brought into conflict with the freedom and purity of elections ? Who has of late run a political race on the side of power who does not feel conscious that he was lifted up and borne along by it ? Who has run against this power that does not know at every step he was pulled back by it ? That the whole power of the Federal Government is now exerted throughout the nation, with wakeful vigilance, to control the next election, is a matter of public notoriety. Does not the proclamation which has gone forth, that all the honors and revenues of the Republic are lawful spoils, to be divided among the victors in the desperate scramble for power, avowedly bring the offices and treasure of the nation into the political market, to be bartered for votes and influence ?

The principles of this Administration are not found in the inaugural address of the 4th of March, 1829.

None of the professions of this Administration have attracted more of public attention than those which related to the suppression of paper money, and the extension of a metallic currency. Under these professions, what has been accomplished ? The Administration struck down the best currency in the world, of equal value in all parts of the Union—every where preferred to gold and silver. The bank that issued this currency was the only means ever discovered by which the State banks could be checked and regulated, and the currency preserved sound, and the constitutional power of the General Government to fix the standard of value maintained—a means that had received the sanction of Washington and Madison, and its benefits established by the experience of half a century. Since the overthrow of this long-tried system, upon which all commercial relations reposed in security, in place of a currency of the precious metals, the following statement will show the wretched condition of the currency, and the alarming increase of paper money called into existence by the influence of the General Government :

In 1832, there were in the United States 330 banks.

Circulation,	-	-	-	-	-	\$61,000,000
Aggregate capital,	-	-	-	-	-	145,000,000

In 1835, there were 604 banks.

Capital,	-	-	-	-	-	400,000,000
Notes in circulation, probably	-	-	-	-	-	200,000,000

So that, since the delusion was got up about gold and silver, banks and bank notes and paper money have more than doubled. Since the prostration of the bank that could hold the local institutions in check, the States seem to be moving forward with a spirit of controversy which shall deluge the land with the deepest and broadest sluices of paper money. And thus, in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, the power of regulating the currency is given up to local banks, and we are thrown back into all the evils of depreciated bills of credit, against which it was one of the main objects of the Constitution to guard.

All men of forecast know that, upon the first great reverse in our commercial relations, we are destined again to experience all the train of calamities which will flow from the depreciation of the millions of paper money now in the hands of the People.



They know that labor will again be robbed of its earnings, and the property of the People sacrificed at public auction.

The appearance of things at present is delusive. The exorbitant prices of property are not signs of real health and vigor in the body politic ; they are rather delusive symptoms of a bloated plethora.

In the face of existing appearances to the contrary, I warn my friends and my constituents, and my country, to be prepared, as well as they can, for the realities that lie behind the present temporary delusion.

Mr. Speaker, permit me here to digress from the consideration of our domestic affairs for a few minutes, for the purpose of inquiring what are the principles of this Administration in regard to its intercourse with foreign nations.

Although the unfortunate difference with France is settled, yet there are some views in relation to it, which ought never to be forgotten. In the year 1830, the French Government took offence at a passage of the President's Message to Congress in 1829, which was construed to be disrespectful to France. It was then determined by the Administration that a difference so trivial, proceeding from a misunderstanding, should not interrupt the friendly relations with our ancient ally that stood by us in the darkest days of the Revolution, and that it should not interfere with or suspend the pending negotiation. Mr. Rives, our Minister at the French court, promptly explained the President's Message in a satisfactory manner, and communicated the result to his Government ; and the following extract of a note from Mr. Martin Van Buren, then Secretary of State, to Mr. Rives, by order of the President, will show how well satisfied he was with the explanation which Mr. Rives had given to the French Government of his Message of 1829:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

*Washington, April 2, 1830.*

"SIR : Your several despatches, to No. 14 inclusive, have been received at this Department, and submitted to the President. He approves fully of your reply to the observations of Prince Polignac in regard to portions of his Message to Congress which refer to the state of our affairs with France. It contains, as far as it goes, a fair exposition of his sentiments upon the point alluded to."

But as it is customary among civilized nations, in friendship and peace, to treat each other with marked respect, even in their official communications between departments of the same Government ; and least the impression should still remain in France, that the President intended a menace in his Message of 1829, and the negotiation thereby be injured, Mr. Van Buren, under the orders of the President, gave still a more ample explanation of the Message of 1829 to the French Government, as fully appears by the following extract of a letter to our Minister at the French Court :

"The friendly predilections which have so long existed between the citizens of the United States and the subjects of His Most Christian Majesty ; the unceasing endeavors of this Government to place the relations of the two countries upon the footing of a still more friendly and mutually beneficial intercourse ; the liberality displayed by the United States, in not pressing upon France, in the hour of her difficulties, the immediate discharge of her responsibilities to our citizens ; the undeviating delicacy with which they have presented their claims in the season of prosperity, and the patience with which they have awaited the result, are considerations which should dissuade the King of France from too readily construing into a tone of



menace the frank, but not unfriendly, language in which the President has expressed the sentiments of the Government and People of the United States. The President has no desire nearer his heart than that of preserving the most harmonious relations with all the world, but particularly with His Majesty the King of France. It was to enable him more certainly to obtain the fulfilment of this first wish of his heart, that he called the national attention, in a spirit of regret and apprehension, to the possible consequences of a protracted continuance of the present untoward state of things. A brave and generous mind never assumes an attitude of menace, as long as any thing can be hoped from a love of justice and a regard to the rights of others. On neither of these, as motives, on the part of His Most Christian Majesty, to a fair adjustment of this most fruitful source of misunderstanding between the two countries, has the President ever entertained a doubt."

In 1835 there again occurred the same difficulty. The French King understood the President's Message to Congress in 1834 to charge his Government with bad faith, and as placing this Government in a menacing attitude towards that of France. The President admitted, without reserve, that, in his Message of 1834, he did not intend to charge the French Government with bad faith, or to make any threat, or to convey any affront whatever, but that he would not explain this misunderstanding to France.

In the progress of the negotiation between the two nations, the controversy was at last narrowed down to the mere misunderstanding as to a passage in the Message of 1834. And upon this point it was decided to devote this nation to the hazards of war, rather than say to the French Government it had placed a meaning on the Message which the President admitted he did not intend to give it.

The following are the positions taken in 1835 by this Government :

"1st. That a foreign Government, in its intercourse with our own, has no right to take any notice whatever of any communication made by the President to Congress in the discharge of his official duties, and, consequently, no right to demand an explanation of the purport of any such message, whatever imputations it may contain, and however offensive and imperious its terms may seem.

2d. That to give or offer such explanations would be to admit the right to claim them, and that such an admission, by subjecting the Executive, in the discharge of a constitutional duty, to the interference and control of a foreign Power, would be inconsistent with the character and dignity of our Government, and a virtual sacrifice of the national honor and independence."

This principal that a foreign nation should not be permitted to inquire into the meaning of a Message of the President to Congress, was held to be so vital, so connected with our national independence, that it was said in debate here by one in confidence, (Mr. CAMBRELENG,) that, if the nation was flowing in blood from Maine to Orleans, the misunderstanding with France would not be explained.

The misunderstanding of 1830 and 1835 occurring between the same nations upon a point in all respects precisely similar was in the first case freely explained ; and in the last, war was deemed preferable to explanation. Whether the Administration was right in 1830 or 1835, I will not undertake here to decide ; but every candid man must see that if the same course had been pursued in the last instance that there was in the first, there would have been no occasion to break the ancient friendship between America and France with any talk of war. Whether the case of 1830 or that of 1835 will be regarded in Europe or America as containing the principle of



this Administration in regard to the subject, no one can tell, as the two cases were alike and the decisions opposite.

In 1830 a French treaty was very much desired, and it was very popular, and was made to cut a great figure in the elections of that time. In 1835 there was a surplus in the Treasury. The war cry and the apparent necessity for fleets and armies were well calculated to induce the nation to consent to such an increase of expenditures as would place the surplus under the control of the Federal Government, and defeat the division of any portion of it among the States.

Sir, I will now return from this foreign digression to our domestic concerns again.

The present dominant party owes its elevation to power more to the promise to retrench the expenses of the Government than to any other cause. The string was struck oftener in the canvass from 1825 to 1829 than any other. "The party," before they came into power, and when they were seeking votes, told the People of this country that the expenditures of the Federal Government were prodigally, dangerously, wastefully extravagant; and that, if they were invested with power, they would speedily introduce such a system of *reform* and *retrenchment* as would bring back the Government to the Jeffersonian economy. The People believed these representations, and put their faith in these solemn pledges of reform; which were a thousand times repeated.

"The party," being snugly seated in power, these pledges were soon forgotten. We have seen seven years glide away, and the first effective movement for retrenchment has not yet been made. In place of retrenchment, we have, during these seven years, seen annual millions added to the wide-spread extravagance of the public expenses. Sir, in my remarks, I intend to rely upon no facts except those that are established by documents that none can question. What I am about to state in regard to the public expenses is taken from a report made to this House by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Woodbury, on the 4th day of January, 1836, and which I now hold in my hand. This report shows the annual expenses of the Government from 1816 to 1834, inclusive; this, together with the estimates in the last annual report of the same Secretary for the years 1835 and 1836, shows the expenses of this Administration, provided the appropriation bills conform to the estimates. The following tabular statement, extracted from the said reports, shows the annual and total expenditures for the eight years of this Administration from 1829 to 1836, contrasted with the annual and total expenditures of the preceding eight years, from 1821 to 1828, inclusive, including the four last years of Mr. Monroe's Administration, and the four years of Mr. Adams's, showing also the amount paid annually of the public debt during both terms:

*Annual and total expenditures  
from '21 to '28, inclusive.*

1821,	\$19,710,136 40
1822,	15,103,343 21
1823,	15,314,171 00
1824,	31,878,538 47
1825,	23,585,804 72
1826,	24,103,398 46
1827,	22,656,764 04
1828,	25,459,479 52

Total,	\$177,831,635 82
	84,337,986 34

93,493,649 48

*Payments during the same  
time of public debt.*

1821,	\$ 8,367,093 62
1822,	8,568,949 12
1823,	5,530,016 41
1824,	16,568,393 76
1825,	12,095,344 78
1826,	11,041,082 19
1827,	10,003,668 39
1828,	12,163,438 07

Total,	\$84,337,986 34
--------	-----------------

Exclusive of public debt.



*Annual and total expenditures  
from '29 to '36, inclusive.*

1829,	\$25,044,358 40
1830,	24,585,281 55
1831,	30,038,446 12
1832,	34,356,698 06
1833,	24,257,298 49
1834,	24,601,982 41
1835,	18,176,141 07
1836,	23,133,640 00
<hr/>	
Total,	\$204,193,846 10
	65,583,562 15
<hr/>	
	138,610,283 95
	93,493,649 48
<hr/>	

\$45,116,634 47

This is the amount of the increase of the public expenditures from 1829 to 1836, over the preceding eight years.

Amount of public debt paid from 1821 to 1828, \$84,337,986 34.

Amount of public debt paid from 1829 to 1836, \$65,583,562 15 ; making the amount paid from 1821 to 1828 \$18,754,424 19 more than the payments from 1829 to 1836.

But the People have been told that the reason why the expenses of the Government were so much increased of late was because the present Administration had paid off so much of the public debt more than had been previously paid in the same space of time. So far from this being true, the foregoing table shows that there had been paid in the eight preceding years \$18,754,424 19 more than during this Administration ; yet we have seen public festivals and *rejoicings* upon the point of the transcendent merit of having paid the public debt.

In regard to the payment of the public debt, no President, since the year 1817, deserves either praise or censure, more than the man in the moon.

Those who passed the law of 1817, for the redemption of the public debt, and the People of the United States, whose industry and enterprise filled the public Treasury, deserve all the credit for the payment of the debt.

Although it is not in place, I will here present a view that will show that the proceeds of the sales of the public lands should be taken from the control of this Government. Under our revenue system, the money power is almost irresponsible. The price of the public lands not being paid by the People in the form of a tax, their attention is not sufficiently directed to the subject to hold their representatives accountable how they use it. This Administration presents a signal instance of the truth of what I say ; they are held to no responsibility for substituting an increase of the public expenditures of over forty-five millions of dollars, in place of retrenchment. While they are dividing the public treasure as spoils among favorites ; in the triumphs of present impunity, they can securely laugh at the simplicity of all those who believed that there was any thing serious in their promises of retrenchment and reform.

This signal instance of escape from public censure proves that our redundant income is paid under such circumstances that it can be squandered by a successful party in contempt of all the maxims of economy. By dividing the public treasure among a sufficient number of partizans, exemption from responsibility can be secured. The only cure for this evil, the only way to restore accountability, is to take the control of the proceeds of the sales of the public lands out of the hands of this central power, and give them to the States.

*Payments during the same  
time of public debt.*

1829,	\$12,383,867 78
1830,	11,355,748 22
1831,	16,174,378 22
1832,	17,840,307 29
1833,	1,543,543 38
1834,	6,176,565 19
1835,	59,150 07
1836,	50,000 09
<hr/>	

Total, \$65,583,562 15

Exclusive of public debt.



The principles of this Administration are not to be found in retrenchment, in the economical management of the public finances. So far, professions and practices have run in directions exactly opposite.

I will now refer to two other documents which do contain the principles, with a view to which this Administration has been conducted, and by the aid of which it has attained its dangerous ascendancy. These principles were imported from one of the States, where they had been tested; and, since their adoption as the basis of federal action, have already wrought a revolution in the theory and practice of our Government.

We are informed by the President, in his veto of the Land bill, that "*money is power!*" and we are informed by him, in his protest, that "the whole executive power being vested in the President, who is responsible for its exercise, it is a necessary consequence that he should have the right to employ agents of his own choice."

Again: he says in the same paper, speaking of the Secretary of the Treasury, "that he was an executive officer, the *mere instrument* of the Chief Magistrate in the execution of the laws."

From these explicit declarations that "*money is power,*" and that the executive officers of this nation are the *mere instruments* of the President, the principles are revealed which have been the basis of that extraordinary ascendancy to which all the checks of the constitution have opposed so feeble a resistance.

By the original theory and practice under our constitution, the public officers were held to be the agents of the People, bound to discharge their duty according to law, and in the selection of whom regard should be had only to integrity and qualifications; and to remove any one of whom for opinion's sake by the Chief Magistrate would be good cause of impeachment. But now, when they are no longer deemed agents of the People, but the mere instruments of the Executive; when they are no longer bound to discharge their offices according to law, but are required to yield obedience to the will of the President; when their continuance in office no longer depends on able and faithful service to the country, but upon unconditional submission to the dictates of power, the character of our Government is changed, and a distinct and rival interest is established between the public officers and the people; the entire agency by which the whole operations of the Government are conducted is thus brought under the control of one man.

The first effort to bring the money power into the same hand was displayed in the proposition to establish a national bank as an instrument of the Treasury upon a capital of public money. The next was seen in the endeavors to subject the Bank of the United States to Governmental dictation.

These schemes having failed, and the complete control of the money power having been resolved on, *the responsibility was taken*, and the public money seized, and is now under the control of no law, placed where the Representatives of the People have no power to go and examine whether it be safe or unsafe, or whether it be used for lawful or unlawful purposes. The vast revenues of this Republic, between the times of collection and disbursement, are used at the discretion of a single mind. At this moment over thirty millions of dollars, the property of the People, are, through the instrumentality of *deposit* banks, loaned out, to whom we have no means of knowing, and for what design we can only conjecture. By making a call for the public deposits, the Secretary could crush any of these deposit banks any day he



circoses; this gives a control over the capital of the States, as well as that of the nation. The power wielded in the Federal Treasury can put up and put down banks at pleasure. It can regulate the price of stocks and property; it can enrich friends and impoverish enemies. It can send millions into a State or city before an election, to be used without interest, to reward obedience, or it can withdraw millions to punish disobedience. The Treasury of the United States is the great central fulcrum that sustains the levers by which ambitious aspirants are raised to power.

There are other views which show more clearly the length, and breadth, and height, and depth of the ill-ingulfing power of money. The President having the appointment of the agency by which the Government is conducted, has, of course, the selection of the hands into which the public treasure shall flow; which enables him to make all offices, and all seekers of office, his "*mere instruments*."

The power derivable from the use of money was not anticipated at the adoption of the Constitution. The Treasury was then empty; and in those good old times of honest simplicity, even the sagacious mind of Patrick Henry did not foresee that the use of money would become the principal element in that executive power which he predicted would destroy the liberty of his country. Thus the money power has been matured and organized, not by the President, not for his use, for his fame was enough for him, but by others under the shade of his military reputation; by a far-reaching sagacity has this golden ladder been erected, upon which they are to climb to greatness in time to come. The operations of the money power have produced effects, before which the world has stood astonished; because the secret springs and principles of action were carefully concealed from the public eye. Throughout we have seen professions and practices running in opposite directions; and yet we have heard the shout of applause as loud for the breach as for the promise. Hence the saying that "the popularity of General Jackson can stand any thing." It is the power to bestow money and office that can stand any thing. General Jackson's power ends on the 4th of March next, but the money power is to be transferred to other hands, where it will continue to do its work. When our venerable President descends from his exaltation, he will see human nature as it is. Of the thronging thousands that revolved in servility around his power, he will find how many crooked their knees for thrift, and how many out of respect for him.

This money power, shielded from all responsibility, from all public inspection, pervading the whole Union, operating upon all interests, brought to bear upon the hopes and fears of millions, is the most ingenious contrivance that was ever devised by the wit of man; and is sweeping along in its wake the right of suffrage, the freedom of the press, State and national legislation.

The declaration that "*money is power*" is most true, alarmingly true. All the hopes of the friends of human liberty, that free government could be maintained, were reposed upon having its operations conducted by officers of integrity and capacity, who were devoted to the People, and not to power. It is impossible that free government can last unless its affairs be managed by such agents.

Having ascertained the principles and the means by which federal power is making its rapid marches over the ruins of the Constitution, the question is, whether we shall take away from it the money, which is the bone and sinew of its strength, and give it to the people, to build up their rights and restore their ancient and constitutional power in the Government.



Having disposed of the preliminary inquiry into the present character and tendencies of federal power, I will now proceed to the investigation of the main question—What shall be done with the surplus revenue?

At this very interesting point of our history, when it is our duty to make a new movement which will vitally affect the dearest interests of our country for many years to come, we surely ought to rise above present or mere party considerations, and look at the future consequences which will in all probability result from the adoption of each of the three plans which have been suggested of disposing of the public money. I will now proceed to consider them in order.

I. As to the propriety of leaving the surplus to accumulate from year to year in the Treasury, and be disposed of as it now is, according to the discretion of the Executive. Some of our ablest calculators tell us that, by January next, there will be fifty millions, and certainly, if unused and unwasted, it would in a few years amount to hundreds of millions. It is evident that, so soon as the amount exceeded all the specie in the United States, every State bank would be in the power of the Treasury, and this system must soon make them all instruments of the Treasury. The political uses and abuses to which the Government could devote these vast sums have already been very briefly noticed. This view of the subject presents to the minds of the friends of a cheap and a pure republican Government anticipations the most gloomy. But, sir, in addition to the political objections to this employment of the public money, there are others entitled to grave consideration.

It is now most evident that the condition of the public treasure is unsafe. Our revenue is collected in the notes of a great number of State banks, which, in all probability, in the first commercial shock, will become valueless, as they did heretofore. There is of the public funds now deposited in the thirty-five local banks \$30,678,879 91. They have of private deposits \$15,043,033 64; and notes in circulation, \$26,243,688 36. Making in all, \$71,965,000 91, and but \$10,198,659 24 of specie—about \$7 of debt to \$1 of specie. There is now due to the Government alone from these banks more than three times the amount of their specie.

The following aggregates exhibit the condition of the thirty-five deposit banks on the first February.

Loans and discounts,	\$65,439,908	Capital,	- -	\$42,356,088
Domestic exchange,	27,149,935	Treasurer U. S.,	- -	28,239,744
Real estate, - -	1,815,238	Public officers,	- -	2,489,135
Due from banks, - -	15,712,977	Due to banks,	- -	14,879,161
Notes of other banks,	9,573,089	Contingent fund,	- -	840,270
Specie, - - - -	10,198,659	Profit and loss, discount and		
Foreign exchange, - -	406,542	interest, - - -	- -	3,189,932
Expenses, - - -	96,591	Circulation, - - -	- -	26,243,688
Other investments, - -	8,777,228	Private deposits,	- -	15,043,033
		Other liabilities, - -	- -	5,937,045
		Difference, - - -	- -	1,970
	<hr/>			<hr/>
	\$139,170,171			\$139,170,171

Sir, what will the People of this country say when they come to understand these facts, and see the present hazardous conditions of their money? Would any prudent man risk his own money under such circumstances? If it would be madness for a man to act so in private life, is it not something more than madness for the servants of the People to act so with their money? In a trust capacity public agents are surely bound to act with as much care as a prudent man would with his own.



But it is not at all improbable that the condition of the People's money is far worse than appears from the reports of these banks. How do we know that these reports are true? We have not the power to examine these banks, and count their money. We know that the deposit banks formerly robbed the Treasury of millions, and made reports that they were safe up to the hour of explosion. Who ever knew a bank that intended to break to apprise the Public of it beforehand?

But, sir, mystery is stamped upon the front of this report. These thirty-five pet banks, in counting up their means to pay their debts, say they have \$8,777,228 79 in "*other investments*"—but they have concealed from the Public what they mean by "*other investments*." But the friends of these banks contend that, although they have not the means in hand to pay the public deposits, yet, by calling on their debtors, they could pay. A call upon their debtors for the amount of the public deposits, upon a sudden emergency, would make an earthquake in the whole paper system of the United States. But we have no means of knowing whether the persons who have borrowed the People's money from the pet banks are either able or willing to pay. I never have known a bank that was managed for political purposes that did not sooner or later break, and unless we speedily reclaim the public treasure, and place it in the custody of the law, millions of it will be lost. But, sir, the loss of the whole would do much less public mischief than will be done by leaving it where it is to be used as it is.

But there is another objection to this mode of using the public money, arising from the injustice of the distribution. The public revenue is used as a banking capital; and while the city of New York has the benefit of ten millions, and the Territory of Michigan over a million and a half, which, it seems, is principally loaned out in New York and Albany, the State of Kentucky has not the use of a dollar in such way as to contribute to the general utility. It is true that a small bank in Louisville has a small sum; but this bank issues no notes, and the circulating medium is not thereby increased. The interest on \$30,000,000 is \$1,800,000 per annum, which is given in spoils to favorites; the People deriving not one cent of interest for the use of their money, and running a great risk of losing the principal. The two banks in Michigan have both together but a capital of \$569,779 99, and of specie but \$97,902 33, yet it seems that, during the year 1835, more than three millions of this public money has passed through their hands. And it seems that they are in the habit of loaning out the public moneys in the cities of New York and Albany for profit. The money of the People has been taken from the custody of the law, and used, regardless of all the maxims of prudence for its safety, and with equal disregard to justice in its distribution. Yes, at this moment the money of the People of Kentucky, which they have earned by honest industry, is loaned out, gratis, to the shavers, and brokers, and speculators, and gamblers in stocks in the city of New York and elsewhere. Every motive should impel us to pass a law promptly to restore to the People, upon the principles of justice and equality, the use of their own money, and thereby rescue it from hazard, and our institutions from corruption.

II.—The second plan of disposing of the thirty millions is to increase the expenses of the Federal Government to that amount in extensive military preparations; in the raising of armies, and in the construction of fortifications, and the building of a Navy.

To induce us to agree to a scheme of national defence upon a scale much more extensive than has ever been deemed safe by any American statesman, we are emphatically reminded, since the war cloud has blown away, of the maxim "in peace,



provide for war ;” and now, for the first time, we are urged to proceed immediately to lay the foundation of a system of preparation for war large enough to exhaust all our present and future means. I desire to know precisely in what sense and to what extent it is proposed to reduce this maxim to practice. In legislation, as in all the active business of life, there is but little information communicated by the re-assertion of those general truths to which, in the abstract form, all men agree, because there is such a diversity in applying them so as to suit the condition of individuals and nations, that, in their abstract form, they convey no distinct idea to the mind. For example, the maxim that is now so earnestly pressed upon our attention, “that peace is the proper season to provide for war,” is sustained by general acquiescence. Yet there are no two nations that act upon this maxim alike. It is limited or extended or modified so as to suit the institutions and condition of each nation, and the genius of the age.

In different ages, according as the spirit of peace or war happened to pervade the earth, we find the same nations varying the size of their navies and armies, to suit the condition of the times.

The maxim, that in time of peace nations should provide for war, as it is understood and practised in Europe at this time, so far as a standing military force is concerned, is exhibited in the following statements :

						Troops.
France,	-	-	-	-	-	400,000
Belgium,	-	-	-	-	-	110,000
Great Britain,	-	-	-	-	-	100,000
Bavaria,	-	-	-	-	-	53,000
Wurtemberg,	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
Hesse Darmstadt,	-	-	-	-	-	8,000
Norway and Sweden,	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
Netherlands,	-	-	-	-	-	77,500
Spain,	-	-	-	-	-	71,300
Prussia,	-	-	-	-	-	222,000
Saxony,	-	-	-	-	-	12,000
Hanover,	-	-	-	-	-	12,000
Baden,	-	-	-	-	-	8,000

The population of the above States is supposed to amount to 103,045,700 souls ; which, if correct, would give eleven soldiers to every 1,000 souls.

Assuming the free population of the United States to be 15,000,000, the proportion of soldiers of the present Army is a fraction less than one to every 2,000 souls. Compared with the levy of troops on the population of the European States, is as one to 22. Total amount of Russian forces is 803,000.

*Navies of Europe, including vessels of war, large and small.*

France, built and building,	-	-	-	-	359
England, built and building,	-	-	-	-	548
Holland,	-	-	-	-	97
Greece,	-	-	-	-	92
Turkey, in 1827, before the battle of Navarino, had	-	-	-	-	90

Thus in Europe it is deemed consistent with the genius of monarchical Governments, taken in connexion with the fact that numerous kingdoms are compacted to-



gether with adjoining boundaries, liable at any time to sudden invasions, to keep always ready to march at a moment's warning, a strong army, and to maintain powerful navies. But, sir, in America, the understanding of the maxim under consideration has been very different. Separated from the old world by an ocean three thousand miles wide, and having no powerful nation in our neighborhood, our geographical position renders a large standing force unnecessary. But that there may be no mistake about a matter so important, we will look into American history to collect the American sense upon the subject of armies, and fleets, and fortifications. At the commencement of General Washington's administration, the regular Army was reduced to 1,216. In the time of the elder Adams, by the act of 27th April, 1798, the Army was increased to 4,159. The act of May 28, 1798, authorizes a provisional Army of 10,000. In Mr. Jefferson's administration, the Army was, by the act of March 16, 1802, reduced to 3,287:

The aggregate of the present Army of the United States is 7,198. Aggregate of the Navy, 52 ships.

After the experience we had in the late war, a system was adopted in 1816, for the gradual increase of the Navy, and for the construction of fortifications, which system has been ever since pursued. Since the year 1816, we have expended, in fortifications, about fourteen millions of dollars; and for the increase and repairs of the Navy, the sum of \$22,092,287 73.

The whole military establishment since 1816 has cost the sum of \$133,273,415 75. In the same time, the whole naval establishment has cost \$66,898,681 96. This, as it appears to me, is going fast enough. This progressive system will grow with our growth and strengthen with our strength, and will keep us supplied with a Navy sufficiently large, and fortifications sufficiently numerous. This progressive system of improving our national defences can be carried on without any increase in the annual expenses of the Government, and leave thirty millions in the Treasury for other uses. The present expenditures are now as great as can be used. We have a report from the proper Department that there is remaining in the Treasury eight millions unexpended of former appropriations; we are officially informed that hands cannot be found and employed in the United States to exhaust the appropriations that are now annually made for the public works. Then where is the utility in making large appropriations, which are to remain unexpended? Such appropriations may defeat the passage of the Land bill, but they will not advance the public works.

In further illustration of the American understanding of how far it is prudent to provide for war during peace, let us see what General Jackson has said on the subject—a man renowned for his warlike achievements, and who may be supposed as friendly to strong national defences as any American statesman ought to be. In his inaugural address on the 4th of March, 1829, he lays down his creed in regard to our military peace establishment in the following words: “Considering standing armies as dangerous to free Governments in time of peace, I shall not seek to enlarge our present establishment.”

And in his first message to Congress in 1829, he says:

“In time of peace we have need of no more ships of war than are requisite to the protection of our commerce. Those not wanted for this object must lay in the harbors, where, without proper covering, they rapidly decay; and, even under the best precautions for their preservation, must soon become useless. Such is already the case with many of our finest vessels; which, though unfinished, will now require im-



mense sums of money to be restored to the condition in which they were when committed to their proper element. On this subject there can be but little doubt that our best policy would be to discontinue the building of ships of the first and second class, and look rather to the possession of ample materials, prepared for the emergencies of war, than to the number of our vessels which we can float in a season of peace as the index of our naval power. Judicious deposits in navy yards of timber and other materials, fashioned under the hands of skilful workmen, and fitted for prompt application to their various purposes, would enable us at all times to construct vessels as fast as they can be manned, and save the heavy expense of repairs, except to such vessels as must be employed in guarding our commerce."

In two subsequent messages the propriety of keeping a navy afloat in time of peace only sufficient to protect our commerce is maintained, and the propriety of accumulating timber in the navy yards is enforced, in place of building new ships. From all which it appears that, in the judgment of General Jackson, no provision should be made for the extension of our peace establishment; that our Navy was sufficiently powerful for the protection of our commerce, and that it was better to lay up timber than to build new ships.

From this view we can collect the sense of this nation as to how far we should go in peace to provide for war.

The American practice, which was established and has been sustained by all the patriots and sages who have gone before us, was not in reference only to our geographical position in the world in regard to other nations, but was mainly produced by the warning voice of history, by which we are taught that the instances are very few where nations have been conquered by foreign invasion, but very numerous where their liberty has been overthrown by their own rulers; that the liberty of nations is in far greater danger from their own powerful fleets and armies, with a Cæsar at their head, than from all foreign enemies combined.

Now the question is, whether we shall, under the temporary impulses of party excitement, abandon the American and adopt the European system of providing for war during peace? Whether republican America shall raise her military peace establishment to come in competition with the establishments of the monarchies of the old world?

But, sir, if it were wise to apply our whole resources to the public defences, the extension of the fortification system is not the best for the attainment of the object. The extent of our country renders it impossible to resist foreign invasion by means of fortifications. The maritime frontier of the United States, from Passamaquaddy to the mouth of the Sabine, following the shores, is over six thousand miles, one-third of which belongs to the Gulf of Mexico; the northern and lake frontier three thousand miles more. This, added to the almost boundless western frontier, makes it apparent that, if the whole surplus produce of the labor of the People of the United States was forced from them in taxes, it would not fortify this vast empire so as to protect it from invasion. And if we had fortifications ready made, on convenient points, on the whole frontier, it would require a standing army of several hundred thousand to man and preserve them. The number of fortifications, from necessity, must be limited to the defence of the cities and the exposed points. The number of fortifications already projected is greater than was required. Fortunately for the nation it has in its power means of defence more cheap and more efficient. The bulwarks of our liberty are to be found in the hearts of a brave People, and not in the stone and mortar of forts.



The bravery of a gallant People, in defence of their homes and their country, has carried us successfully and gloriously through two wars with the most powerful nation in the world. The rational means of national defence for such a People in time of peace, are to protect them by wise and equal laws, and to lighten their burdens by a cheap and pure administration of the Government, so that they may prosper and grow in strength and power and intelligence, and in wealth, and their confidence in the Government may be established. All the enemies of freedom combined could not conquer such a People so governed. On the contrary, an extensive military establishment, which would oppress the People with heavy taxes, would check their spirit ; would paralyze their industry ; would wear away their attachment to the Government, and would, in the end, change the national character, and prepare the way for a Bonaparte, at the head of the national guards.

There is a mode of expenditure more efficient for the attainment of the object than that which is to be found in standing armies and in fortifications. In an extensive country, the success of modern war depends upon the celerity with which armies and supplies can be conveyed from place to place. And as the strength of this vast nation in men and means must forever remain in the interior and not on the frontiers—in the heart and not in the extremities, the great means of military defence are to be found in the construction of roads on which men and provisions can be conveyed to meet danger wherever it may approach the borders. For example, if there were a railroad from Lexington to Charleston, supplies of men and arms and cannon and provisions could be conveyed along the whole line in a few days, and the enemy met and repelled before he had time to do mischief. [In this view of the subject is not a road, with a view to military defence, better than a fort ?] Say at Charleston there was an impregnable fortress, an enemy of course would not land within the range of its guns. He would keep at a respectful distance, and advance upon undefended places. Upon ordinary roads it would require months to move an army and heavy military munitions from the interior to Charleston, in South Carolina, to meet the foe. [In this view, which is the best means of national defence—forts on the frontier, or railroads, like veins and arteries leading from the heart to the extremities of the body politic ?] While this is the most efficient, it is the cheapest possible mode of providing for war. The cost of transportation on ordinary roads, during the revolutionary and late war, is more than would construct roads, on the modern plan, wherever required in the United States. The cause which retarded the military operations in the late war, and kept our brave soldiers so often in a state of starvation, and exposed so many of them to slaughter, was the difficulty of supplying them by the modes of conveyance then in use.

But, sir, this mode of providing for war by furnishing the means of rapid and cheap conveyance of men and supplies from one part of our extensive country to another, stands in favorable contrast with all other modes of providing for war, in several important views. Standing armies and fortifications are worse than useless in time of peace ; they eat up annually millions of the industry of the People. But roads are alike useful in peace and war. In war they enable us to throw our power promptly to all places menaced with danger. In peace they furnish the means of rapid and cheap conveyance of the surplus products of industry to all the markets of the world. Money, and the means of sustaining armies, are the essential elements in modern war. Roads, by the commercial facilities which they would furnish in time of peace, would enrich the nation, and enable it to stand up under the burdens of war.



Then, sir, looking [at this subject alone in its military aspect, I would reserve enough of our surplus treasure to strengthen and build up this great arm of national defence—the means of rapid transportation in war, and the means of enriching the nation in peace.

The next objection which I shall urge against the scheme of applying the whole income to the construction of ships and forts is, that it violates a great fundamental principle of public policy—a principle which has heretofore, in the administration of the finances, been disregarded, to the great injury of the Western country. The principle is this: as the public revenue is collected from all the People of the nation, in its disbursement it should be returned to the parts of the country from which it has been drawn, with as great a regard to equality as a due attention to the aggregate interest of the Public will allow. I agree with my friend from Maine, (Mr. EVANS,) that the duties on foreign merchandise are paid by the consumers. I agree that in the disbursement of public money, the preponderance of the general good, and not the incidental benefit, should be the criterion. But I disagree with him that, in the expenditure of the public money, the incidental advantage should weigh nothing. It is true that the construction of a fortification in Kentucky merely to secure to the People the incidental advantage of the expenditure would be ridiculous. But it would be equally ridiculous to make a road along the margin of the sea for the sake of the incidental benefit. It has pleased God so to form our extensive country, so to diversify the interests of different sections, that the enlightened statesman, in the conduct of our public affairs, will never find the general and incidental advantages of the Government to come in conflict. When the improvements are made which Nature indicates should be on the frontier and in the interior, the general and local interests of the whole Union will be sustained; and the preponderance of general good will be found in harmony with the incidental advantages of an enlightened administration.

Now, sir, this scheme of devoting our whole means to the Navy and fortifications will perpetuate and fasten upon the country the unjust policy of expending the whole revenue of the Republic on the seaboard—a policy that has long prevailed—to exhaust the West to enrich the East.

Sir, let us pause here for a moment to consider how the flagrantly unjust and partial expenditure of the public money on one side of the Union, for the support of only part of the great national interest, first took its rise, and how it has been continued. When the Constitution went into operation, all the States then in existence were situated on the Atlantic ocean. That instrument (as was natural) received such constructions, and was reduced to practice, so as to suit the then existing interests of the People. They then depended on foreign commerce for the exchange of the surplus products of their industry. To facilitate this foreign commerce, the system which has since cost the nation millions on millions was commenced, of making breakwaters, piers, improvement of bays, inlets, harbors, the mouths of rivers, and lighthouses, &c. &c. But, since the adoption of the Constitution, the number of the States has doubled, or will, probably, in a few days; the nation has spread over the interior of the continent; an internal commerce has grown up far more valuable than the foreign commerce; yet there are still many good people in the old States who believe that ours is a salt water Constitution, and that it would be the most unconstitutional thing in the world to spend a dollar of the public money above the ebb and



flow of the tides. Such, sir, is the force of old habits of thought, especially when interest happens to run in the same channel. The clause in the Constitution which has been construed to confer the power on Congress to make improvements for the benefit of foreign commerce, reads in the following words : Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." Although the very same words are used in regard to foreign and domestic commerce, yet many of our Atlantic brethren, while they are willing to expend millions to protect, defend, and facilitate foreign commerce, believe it would be exceedingly unconstitutional to give a cent for the security and facility of interior commerce. But, sir, the time has arrived when this salt water exposition of the Constitution must give way to the progress of the national expansion. Our Constitution was formed for the continent, and not for the seaboard. Its scope is sufficiently broad to comprehend within its beneficent provisions every part of our extended and extending country.

Sir, the present unjust scheme of confining the national defences to the building of ships and the erection of fortifications, and the application of our whole means to these objects, will perpetuate this old rotten partial system of expending all the public money on one side of the country. One reason why a system so revolting to reason, and so prostrative of justice, has been so long continued, is this : " money is power ;" and this mode of partial expenditure, while it has exhausted the West, has so enriched the great cities on the seacoast, that they have acquired an undue influence upon the legislation of the country.

Since the year 1791, there have been very nearly a thousand millions of dollars collected from the People of this country, and expended by this central Government. Of this vast sum, the Western country has paid its full proportion. Yet the People of that country have been doomed for near half a century to see their substance flow into the National Treasury, and from thence poured out in profusion along the mara-time frontier.

To conclude this branch of the subject. I am opposed to voting all our means to a Navy and forts, because it would be the adoption of a radical change in the policy of our Government upon the spur of the occasion, without consulting the People ; because it would lay the foundation of a large standing army, and bring heavy charges on the country ; because the building of ships and forts are not the only nor the best way to provide for the national defence ; because it would perpetuate a partial system of disbursing the public treasure, by giving it all to the seaboard ; and because it would lead to such a vast increase of the expenses of the Government, and consequently to such an extension of its power and patronages that our liberty would be rendered unsafe.

Having first reasoned to show that our revenue should not be suffered to accumulate in the Treasury ; and, secondly, to prove that it should not be all expended on the seacoast in ships and fortifications ; I will now, in the third and last place, attempt to prove that so much of it as has arisen, and will arise, from the sales of the public lands, ought to be divided among the States. This plan stands recommended by the fact that it has been long and deliberately considered and approved by the People, it having at a former session passed both Houses of Congress by large majorities, and has received the approbation of many of the State Legislatures.

Sir, what is the state of the case ? We now have in the Treasury \$20,571,125 75,



which has accrued from the sales of the public domain, (which is the common property of the People of the United States,) over and above the wants of the Federal Government. Now the great question is, whether this large sum of money shall be divided among the States, to be expended under their own councils, for the improvement of the condition of the People; or shall it be added to the swelling flood of federal expenditure, to raise still higher federal power, and extend the range of federal patronage to a broader circumference? Shall the whole of our surplus revenue be thrown into the maelstrom, the grand whirlpool of centrepetal extravagance, where it will draw after it the remaining barriers of freedom into the same gorge? These are the weighty questions on the decision of which hangs the fate of liberty. If the division among the States should take place, the following statement will show the proportion of each State of what is already in the Treasury:

*TABLE showing the amount to which each State will be entitled.*

	Federal population.	Share for each State.	Fifteen per cent. to new States.	Total to new States.
Maine - - - - -	399,437	689,028		
New Hampshire - - - - -	269,326	464,587		
Massachusetts - - - - -	610,408	1,052,953		
Rhode Island - - - - -	97,194	167,659		
Connecticut - - - - -	297,665	513,472		
Vermont - - - - -	280,657	484,133		
New York - - - - -	1,918,553	3,309,503		
New Jersey - - - - -	319,922	551,865		
Pennsylvania - - - - -	1,348,072	2,325,424		
Delaware - - - - -	75,432	130,120		
Maryland - - - - -	405,843	700,079		
Virginia - - - - -	1,023,503	1,765,554		
North Carolina - - - - -	639,747	1,103,563		
South Carolina - - - - -	455,025	784,918		
Georgia - - - - -	429,811	741,423		
Kentucky - - - - -	621,832	1,072,660		
Tennessee - - - - -	625,263	1,078,578		
Ohio - - - - -	935,884	1,614,400	230,844	1,845,244
Louisiana - - - - -	171,694	296,172	67,561	363,733
Indiana - - - - -	343,031	591,728	325,485	917,213
Illinois - - - - -	157,147	271,078	483,760	754,838
Missouri - - - - -	130,419	224,972	174,354	399,326
Mississippi - - - - -	110,358	190,367	788,403	978,770
Alabama - - - - -	262,508	452,826	541,940	994,766

It is estimated that the annual receipts from sales of the public domain will in future be ten millions of dollars. From this data a calculation can easily be made of the proportion of each State for any given number of years. If the Land bill should pass, I have no doubt but the principle of it will become the permanent policy of the country. There is yet in the limits of the United States more than a thousand millions of acres of unsold land; it would supply ample funds for the States for centuries to come. What stupendous results might be produced upon the power, the agriculture, the commerce, the wealth, the comfort, the intelligence and happiness of the People of the United States, by this application of their great public domain! This comprehensive, this all-pervading, this equal, this magnificent plan for the disposal of the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, in practice a few years, would exhibit a degree of improvement in the United States surpassing all the nations of the



earth. The modern system of constructing roads and improving rivers, with the full development of the power of steam, would bring the distant parts of the country so near together, that constant intercourse, mutual interest, and commercial exchanges would mould the discordant parts into a homogeneous national character, which would be the best guaranty for the perpetuity of the Union, and the durability of American liberty.

While the interests of the whole country would harmoniously unite in this great measure, the Western country has a right especially to call aloud for its adoption, where, for reasons already given, the Constitution has never been considered in full force. The present condition of the Treasury furnishes the means to extend the fostering care of the Government to all the great interests of the whole Union, and forever to wipe out the reproach of favoritism to one portion of the country, to the oppression of another. Kentucky, although entirely neglected heretofore, though deprived of a fair participation in the benefits of the Government, has never complained at sustaining her share of its burdens. A full proportion of the taxes has always been paid, and in the two wars more than her proportion of blood was shed for the general defence. Ever since the year 1791 she has looked on at a partial administration of the public finances, by which her substance has been drawn away, and devoted to improvements in which she had only a remote and consequential interest. And while the public money has been thus disposed of, what disposition has been made of large portions of the public lands?

The following table will show the liberal grants which have been made by Congress to the new States :

State or Territory.	Appropriated for internal improvements, education, or charitable institutions.				Lands appropriated for seats of government.	Saline reservations.	Aggregate appropriations for each State and Territory.
	Number of acres for internal improvements.	Number of acres for colleges, academies, and universities.	The one thirty-sixth part of public lands appropriated for common schools.	For religious and charitable institutions.			
Ohio - -	922,937	92,800	678,576	43,525	-	-	1,737,838
Indiana - -	384,728	46,080	556,184	-	2,560	23,040	1,012,592
Illinois - -	480,000	46,080	977,457	-	2,560	206,128	1,712,225
Missouri - -	-	46,080	1,086,639	-	2,449	46,080	1,181,248
Mississippi - -	-	46,080	685,884	-	1,280	-	733,244
Alabama - -	400,000	46,560	722,190	23,040	1,620	23,040	1,216,450
Louisiana - -	-	46,080	873,973	-	-	-	920,053
Michigan - -	-	46,080	543,893	-	10,000	-	599,973
Arkansas - -	-	46,080	950,253	-	-	-	996,338
Florida - -	-	46,080	877,484	23,040	1,120	-	947,724
Aggregate	2,187,665	508,000	7,952,538	89,605	21,589	298,288	11,057,685

Kentucky led the way into the Western wilderness, and fought the battles for the conquest of the Western lands, and now sees them partitioned out among new comers, and herself excluded from all participation.

But notwithstanding the long exclusion of Kentucky from a full and fair enjoyment of the benefits of the General Government, she would disclaim, and I, as one of



her representatives, knowing her liberal and elevated spirit, would not venture to excite sectional feelings. She is for a policy that embraces the whole Union, and all of the great interests of the Union. She is still willing, as she always has been willing, to vote money to the support of a Navy, to protect our foreign commerce in peace, and to defend the country in war. Formerly, when the Navy had shrunk away to nothing, under the frowns of the then ascendant party, the spell was broken, and the Navy raised and called into favor by the voice of a Kentuckian—the same voice that has been heard for thirty years in all the times of national emergency. Yet some unknown person has written to the distant newspapers that myself and some of my friends had given a vote unfriendly to the Navy. This unfounded slander is made manifest by the fact, that I have voted, ever since I have been in Congress, for every recommendation of this Administration for the benefit of the Navy, and now stand ready to vote for the estimates sent in at the commencement of this session. Kentucky is still willing to contribute her portion of the requisite millions to go on with the fortifications and all the national defences; she desires to abate nothing from the annual appropriations for the improvement of the seacoast. But while she is willing, as she has always been willing, to stand by and uphold the great interests of the other portions of the Union, she would be recreant to herself if she did not demand her rights in a tone that would no longer be patient under refusal. As we need no fortifications, no Navy, no standing army, in the nature of things, the only great national interests which could be maintained by legislation in the West are education, and the construction of highways along which the surplus products of industry could be safely, cheaply and speedily conveyed to market.

In former ages the interior of continents, cut off from the general intercourse of nations, remained in ignorance and poverty; but modern roads and steam power are rapidly working a revolution in human affairs. They are carrying into the most remote, interior, and secluded situations, enterprise, intelligence, and wealth, and all the improvements of civilized and cultivated man, which were in other days exclusively enjoyed by maritime countries. The great interest of the Western People is to have their roads and rivers placed in a condition to enable them to reap the advantages of the modern improvements in interior communication; and as the internal commerce of the United States, has become so much more valuable than the foreign, reason, policy, and justice unite in requiring that at least as much of the public money should be devoted to its protection. If it were not for old habits and antiquated prejudices in regard to foreign and domestic commerce, what reason could be given for the outlay of millions for the protection of the lesser, while not a cent is given for the promotion of the greater interest? If the surplus was divided, and Kentucky had the immediate use of \$621,832, to which she would be entitled, and her annual proportion hereafter, she would then be on a footing with the other sections of the country; the People would be relieved from the taxation necessary to pay the heavy debts which that State is incurring to carry on her internal improvements. She would be provided with the means to sustain a system of general education, and thus to improve the intelligence of the people, the only foundation upon which free government can securely rest. She would be replenished with money. The wages of labor would be high, the prices of produce would be kept up, and the blessings of this munificent plan would be equally extended to improve the condition, and happiness, and security of the poor and the rich, without distinction or respect of persons. Will any Kentuckian, will any just man, say that Kentucky shall not enjoy her fair



proportion of the price of the public lands—lands, for the conquest of which her gallant sons spent their youth, their substance, and their blood—lands that they have redeemed from the forest, and made saleable and valuable by the sweat of their brow—lands that, by their enterprise, they have made to supply your treasury with sixty millions of dollars ?

Among the repugnant propositions which have been maintained by this Administration, none are more striking than those relating to the disposition of the public domain. In the annual message of 1832 is to be found the following scheme of getting rid of the public lands. The President says: “It seems to me to be our true policy that the public lands shall cease as soon as practicable to be a source of revenue, and that they be sold to settlers in limited parcels at a price barely sufficient to reimburse to the United States the expense of the present system, and the cost arising under our Indian compacts. The advantages of accurate surveys and undoubted titles now secured to purchasers, seem to forbid the abolition of the present system, because none can be substituted which will more perfectly accomplish these important ends. It is desirable, however, that in convenient time this machinery be withdrawn from the States, and the right of soil and the future disposition of it surrendered to the States respectively in which it lies.”

This recommendation is repeated in the veto of the Land bill; yet the principal reason given for the veto is because the public lands are common property, to which all the States have an equal right, and because the Land bill gives a larger proportion of the proceeds to the new States than to the old.

According to these opposite views, it would be proper to deprive the old States of any share in the public lands whatever. Yet to give the new States 10 per cent. more of the proceeds would be such injustice to the old States as to constitute good cause for a veto.

We now stand upon the point of time; we are now surrounded by the circumstances favorable to that great revolution in our national policy, by which the blessings of our free institutions, and the advantages of justice, shall be made to pervade the whole Union, and be carried home to the dwelling of every citizen, by which love and confidence in the Government shall be shed abroad in every heart, and the cement of the Union be made more firm and durable; by which the authority of the General Government shall be thrown back within the pale of the Constitution and laws, and the right arm of the “*money power*” cut off. Yes, this is the important point of time when these glorious ends are to be accomplished; or when the present corrupt and partial system is to be enlarged and doubly rivited on the country for ages to come—a system that will continue to exalt the power and patronage of this central Government; that will continue to enfeeble the power of the States; that will continue to paralyze the defences of liberty; that will finally make the tax-payers *here*, what they are over the face of the whole earth *elsewhere*, slaves to the tax-consumers; that will, under the forms of a free Constitution, devote the labor of the common people to the support of an aristocracy and a throne.



